DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 317 CS 501 346

AUTHOR Housel, Thomas J.; McDermott, Patrick J.
TITLE The Perceived Credibility and Persuasiveness of a Message Source as Affected by Initial Credibility, Style of Language, and Sex of Source.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Portland, Oregon, April 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Problems; *Credibility; Information Sources; *Language Styles; Language Usage; *Research; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Language Intensity

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate four problem areas of communication research: source credibility, language intensity, the gender of source as it affects the source's persuasiveness and credibility, and the scarcity of multifactor studies using gender of source as one of the independent variables. Independent variables for the study, which employed a 2x2x2 factorial design, were initial source credibility, gender of source, and language intensity. Pretests given to the 250 subjects established high and low levels of initial source credibility and language intensity. Dependent variables were source credibility and attitude favorableness toward the message position. Results indicated that a source's initial credibility was not affected by the source's gender or language usage and that the low credible sources were more persuasive than the high credible sources. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED122317

The Perceived Credibility and Persuasiveness of a Message Source as Affected by Initial Credibility, Style of Language, and Sex of Source

Thomas J. Housel
First Year Doctoral Student
University of Utah, Salt Lake City

and

Dr. Patrick J. McDermott
Assistant Professor
University of Wyoming, Laramie

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas J. Housel
Patrick J. McDermott
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Submitted to:

Dr. Cal G. Hylton

Interpersonal Communication Interest Group

for the

International Communication Association

Portland, Oregon - April, 1976

CS 501 346

The Perceived Credibility and Persuasiveness

of a Message Source as Affected by

Initial Credibility, Style of Language, and Sex of Source

Abstract

The experiment was designed to investigate the variables of source credibility, language intensity, and gender of source as they affect a source's persuasiveness and credibility.

The study employed a 2X2X2 factorial design. The independent variables manipulated were source credibility, language intensity, and gender of source. Pretests were used to establish high and low levels of initial source credibility and language intensity. The dependent variables were source credibility and attitude favorableness toward the message position.

The results of the experiment indicated that a source's initial credibility was not affected by the source's gender or language usage. The results also revealed that the low credible sources were more persuasive than the high credible sources.

Suggestions for future research were made based on the results of the study.

The Perceived Credibility and Persuasiveness

of a Message Source as Affected by

Initial Credibility, Style of Language, and Sex of Source

This study was designed to investigate four problem areas of communication research. The first communication problem area reviewed was the induction of different levels of initial source credibility and the inadequacies of past research in dealing with this area of communication research. The second problem area reviewed was the difficulty of operationally defining intense language and the reasons for the conflicting results of past studies in this area. The third area of communication research literature investigated was the inconsistency of past research to account for the effect that a source's sex has on that source's persuasiveness and credibility. Another inadequacy of past communication research reviewed was the scarcity of multi-factor studies using gender of source as one of the independent variables.

Many experiments have investigated the effects of varying levels of source credibility using the fixed ethos model. Andersen and Clevenger (1963, p. 60) define the fixed ethos model thusly,

> In most studies the ethical element is treated as relatively fixed in value during the communication act, and persuasion is construed as the linking of a proposition with an approved source for a positive effect or a disproved source for a negative one.

A study by Haiman (1949) investigated the effects of varying degrees (high, medium, and low) of initial source credibility on attitude change using the fixed ethos model. Haiman found that the source he

intuitively believed to be of high credibility was significantly more persuasive than the sources he intuitively believed to be of medium or low credibility. There were no significant differences in the attitude change between the subjects believing they had heard a medium or low credible source. If Haiman had been able to manipulate the medium and low level credibility conditions as successfully as the high level credibility conditions, it seems likely that there would have been significant differences in attitude change between all credibility manipulations in the predicted direction.

Paulson (1954) also used the fixed ethos model in an experiment very similar to that of Haiman (1949). Paulson attributed the same speech to two different sources, a college professor (high credible) and a student (low credible). Paulson intuitively believed that these two sources would be viewed by his subjects as possessing different degrees of credibility. There was no significant difference in attitude change between either source condition for female subjects, but there were significant changes in the predicted direction for male subjects. Paulson's findings contradict the results of Haiman's (1949) study for female subjects.

A more recent study by Greenberg and Miller (1966) also used the fixed ethos model. In a series of four studies, the experimenters investigated differences in the persuasiveness of unknown, low, and high credible sources. These researchers attempted to induce the different levels of credibility using their intuitions to construct the different source introductions. These researchers failed to induce truly different levels of source credibility as evidenced in the results of their study.

The findings of an article by McCroskey and Dunham (1966) point to other possible reasons for the confounding effects of credibility inductions in communication research. In an experiment testing the effect of unknown and neutral sources on a subject's perception of credibility, McCroskey and Dunham found that unknown sources were rated higher on credibility than neutral sources. The authors explain the results by stating that the subjects typically used in these experiments are, for the most part, only subjected to high credibility sources and would be conditioned to expect any source, even an unknown source, to have high credibility. In a plea for better control over credibility inductions, McCroskey and Dunham state, "ethos levels need to be clearly specified if we are to generalize from one experiment to another." A replication of this study conducted by Holtzman (1966) reported similar findings. In summarizing the results of both studies Holtzman stated, "It seems clear that to enhance the probability of the contribution to a unified theory of persuasion all experimental designs should account for ethos effects."

In a number of more recent studies (Baudhuin, 1971; Mehrley and McCroskey, 1970; Schweitzer, 1971; and Whitehead, 1971) the degree of source credibility was manipulated as an independent variable. Each of the above mentioned studies differentiated between high and low credible sources on the basis of experimenter intuition. Only one study (Baudhuin, 1971), as in the present study, measured degree of credibility as an independent variable and measured it as a dependent variable.

Many of the studies reviewed (Bauchuin, 1971; King, 1966; McCroskey, 1966; Mehrley and McCroskey, 1970; Ware and Tucker, 1975; and Wheeless, 1974) checked the source credibility inductions intuitively determined by the experimenters with posttests. A posttest measure of credibility can only tell the researcher how a source's credibility is perceived after the experimental treatments have taken place. A plethora of studies (Gilkinson, Paulson, and Sikkink, 1954; Hovland and Mandell, 1952; Kraus, 1960; and Sikkink, 1956) can be cited to show that the treatment condition itself can affect a source's credibility. It follows that posttests of credibility are of little or no value in determining the success of initial credibility inductions.

Bettinghaus states (1968, p. 133), "One of the problems facing the persuasive communicator is the extent to which he ought to use words that may elicit highly affective responses from his audience." By reviewing the literature pertaining to language intensity, one is hard put to find a conclusive answer to Bettinghaus' statement. A study by Bowers (1963) found low intensity language to be more effective in persuading subjects than high intensity language. In seeming contradiction to Bowers' study are the results of a recent study by Emmert (1974, p. 20) indicating that,

> high intensity language in communication can be more effective than low intensity language under conditions in which the recipients of the message are not in disagreement with the position presented in the message.

Emmert, unlike Bowers, used a pretest to determine the intensity of the language to be used in his final experimental messages. The important difference between the two studies was that Bowers intuitively decided what constituted intense language and Emmert allowed

his subjects to decide. Clearly, this method is more objective than experimenter intuition. The problem with using intuitive judgments to determine language intensity is the potential for experimenter bias.

The Bowers (1963) and Emmert (1974) studies only measured the effect of intense language on attitude change. Other experiments (Baudhuin, 1971; Bowers and Osborn, 1966; and Reinsch, 1971) have investigated the effect of intense language on source credibility as well as a source's persuasiveness. The results of these studies have been inconsistent.

An experiment by Baudhuin (1971) used obscene language for an intense language condition and found obscene language to be a depressor of attitude change. The study also revealed that obscene language had a negative effect upon source credibility. (When comparing obscene language to intense language it is important to note that obscene language may represent a different type of intense language than is normally used in language intensity experiments. This being the case, alternate explanations may be devised for the results of studies that use obscene language as opposed to some alternate form of intense language. Throughout this study, when obscene language is equated with other forms of intense language, the reader is advised to be aware of the possibility of an alternate explanation.)

McEwen and Greenberg (1970) reporting dissimilar results found highly intense messages to be judged as clearer and the source as more dynamic than low intensity messages. If one equates intense language to metaphorical language (as Bettinghaus, 1968, p. 133 did) a recent study by Reinsch (1971) offers partial support for the study by McEwen

and Greenberg (1970). Reinsch found metaphorical language as opposed to non-metaphorical language in persuasive discourse was significantly more effective in changing attitudes. Reinsch found no support for his contention that the use of metaphorical language increases a source's credibility. A problem with the Reinsch study was the fact that the metaphors used in the persuasive messages were constructed using his intuitions about what constituted intense language. A study by Bowers and Osborn (1966) also tested the effect of metaphorical language in persuasive messages. Bowers and Osborn's findings were inconclusive in determining the persuasive effects of metaphorical language. The results of their study indicated an interaction between source, message topic, and type of metaphor. This three way interaction greatly limited the generalizability of their findings. As in the Reinsch study, Bowers and Osborn placed heavy reliance on their intuition about what constituted intense language. Upon examining the different messages used by Bower and Osborn (two metaphorical, two literal) one might view each message as containing intense language. Most of the studies (Bowers, 1963; Bowers and Osborn, 1966; McEwen and Greenberg, 1970; and Reinsch, 1971) reviewed did not pretest language intensity to confirm the experimenters' intuitions.

If an experimenter determines language intensity using his own judgment, a pretest should be used to confirm his intuition.

Two studies (Baudhuin, 1971; and Emmert, 1974) did pretest their language intensity inductions, but the results of the two experiments were inconsistent. Emmert (1974) found intense language to be more persuasive and Baudhuin (1971) found obscene language to be less persuasive.

Because of the social norms and roles placed upon members of the opposite sexes, this study included gender of source as an independent variable to fill the void left by many of the other studies reviewed (Mehrley and McCroskey, 1970; Schweitzer, 1971; and Whitehead, 1971). In no instance in the literature reviewed did any one experiment include source credibility, intense language, and gender of source as independent variables and source credibility and attitude change as dependent variables.

A study by Goldberg (1968) found that female subjects rated the professional work of men higher than the identical work of women. The difficulty with this study was that only female subjects were used. We do not know if similar results would have occured with male subjects. Goldberg (1968) in his study of the stereotypic evaluation of professionals may have been in reality measuring source credibility. This being the case, the findings of Goldberg's study would seem to lend support to a more recent study by Wheeless (1971).

Wheeless found male speakers to be more persuasive than female speakers in an individual test condition. An early study by Knower (1935) found female speakers in an individual test condition to be more persuasive than male speakers. The contradictory results of these two studies in addition to the results of a study by Cathcart (1955) indicating that sex was not significantly related to persuasibility revealed a need for more definitive research on the sex variable in persuasive communication.

Justification for the Study

Reviewing the literature on source credibility revealed several

inadequacies. Past researchers studying source credibility have neglected to use pretests to insure that they had established truly different levels of initial source credibility. The conflicting results of the source credibility research reviewed may be attributable to the use of experimenter intuition to determine different levels of credibility. Instead of using experimenter intuition in establishing different levels of initial source credibility, a more objective method would have been to ask a group of subjects (similar to those to be tested) what they deemed to represent different levels of source credibility. In an attempt to overcome the weaknesses of past research to control the credibility variable, the present study used a pretest to establish initial levels of source credibility and a posttest to determine terminal source credibility. This study also used subjects to generate initial levels of source credibility in order to avoid the possibility of experimenter bias when using experimenter intuition to determine initial levels of source credibility.

There have been many inconsistencies in the results of the past research reviewed examining the language intensity variable. The use of experimenter intuition without a pretest to determine different levels of language intensity may have been the cause of these inconsistencies. The results of those studies (Baudhuin, 1971; and Emmert, 1974) that did pretest for language intensity were inconsistent. It was these inconsistencies and methodological weaknesses that prompted the present study to attempt a further exploration of the language intensity variable. By controlling for experimenter bias in the selection of language and by using a multi-factored approach to the

problem, the present study attempted to shed new light on the language intensity variable.

The past studies investigating the gender variable have one failing in common. They were not multi-factored. In any communication situation were gender of source is studied, other communication variables are likely to be present and to affect the results. If the previous studies reviewed had taken into account source credibility as a potential confounding variable, they might have included it as an independent and dependent variable as was done in this study.

The present study asked the following research question.

> How will a receiver's attitudes and perceptions of a source's credibility be affected by a source's initial credibility, use of language, and gender of source?

Method

This experiment employed a 2X2X2 factorial design. Three independent variables were manipulated: initial source credibility; gender of source; and language intensity. Two levels (high and low) of credibility and language intensity were manipulated. The effect of these three independent variables on credibility and attitude position was measured using a posttest for both dependent variables. There were eight experimental conditions.

Subjects

Two hundred and five subjects were used in the study. Approximately half the subjects were male and half female. The subjects were drawn randomly from two California colleges, a California public library, and the University of Wyoming. The ages of the subjects sampled were 15 years to 64 years. The median age was 32 years.

Procedures

Because of the confounding effects of pre and posttesting the experimental group, an equivalent group was used to generate and test the independent variables of source credibility and language intensity. Forty-four subjects (approximately half male and half female) were used in the pretesting procedure. Twenty of the forty-four subjects were used to generate intense words and high and low credible sources. The subjects were also instructed to list the sources' occupations. The words and sources were then used to construct a five page questionnaire consisting of fourteen sources (eight male and six female) with one sentence introductions listing each source's occupation.

The remainder of the questionnaire consisted of thirty words generated from the subjects. The Berlo, Lemmert, and Mertz (1969, p. 574) credibility rating scales followed each source's introduction. A five point interval scale was used. Each word was followed by a seven point intensity scale. The remaining 24 subjects were then administered the handouts.

Two messages, one intense, one not intense, were constructed from the pretests for word intensity. Each message was constructed from seven general arguments for "Capital Punishment". The intense message contained the intense words generated from the pretests. The non-intense message was exactly the same as the intense message but did not include the intense words. The messages were preceded by the source introductions (two male, two female) derived from the pretests. A four page handout was constructed combining the messages, source introductions (which included a male or female name), credibility, and attitude scales.

There were eight different four page pamphlets which constituted the eight treatment conditions. The pamphlets were administered in random order to 161 subjects. All subjects were debriefed.

Operationalization of Dependent Variables

Initial and posttreatment source credibility were defined in terms of the Berlo, et al. (1969) credibility scales. The scales represented three dimensions of source credibility; safety, qualification, and dynamism.

Attitude was operationally defined as the difference between treatment groups as measured by a modified Likert scale. The two

modifications included were suggested by Emmert (1970; 1971). First, subjects were used to generate attitudinal statements for and against the topic area "Capital Punishment". Second, the statements were subjected to factor analysis.

Factor analysis of the modified Likert revealed three attitudinal dimensions; 1) social, 2) evaluative, and 3) caution. The statements are then submitted to his subjects and their responses are subjected to item analysis.

Results

A three-way analysis of variance of the posttest results was performed on the two dependent variables to identify any main interaction effects on the independent variables. A three-way ANOVA program was used for this procedure. When interaction effects were witnessed, the Duncan's Multiple Range (see Brunning and Kintz, 1968, p. 115-117) post hoc test was used to isolate the significant differences among the individual or collapsed cell means. A significance level of .05 was used for all statistical tests.

There were no significant main or interaction effects for the safety dimension of credibility (see Table I).

The analysis of variance for the qualification dimension of credibility revealed a significant main effect for credibility ($F = 13.44$, $p < .05$; see Table II). Initially high credible sources, regardless of gender or language usage, were perceived as being more qualified than initially low credible sources after the persuasive message.

There were no significant main or interaction effects for the dynamism dimension of credibility (see Table III).

The analysis of variance on the social dimension of attitude revealed a significant main effect for credibility ($F = 4.413$, $p < .05$; see Table IV). The social dimension of attitude scores from subjects responding to low credible sources (regardless of gender of source or language used) were more favorable toward the experimental topic than those subjects responding to the high credible sources. Further, the social dimention revealed a significant ($F =$

4.281, $p < .05$) three-way interaction (gender X credibility X language). Post hoc tests (Duncan's Multiple Range) revealed that subjects responded in a significantly ($m = 1.204$; $m = 1.038$; $p < .05$) more favorable manner to a low credible male source using non-intense language than they did toward a high credible male source using intense or non-intense language (see Table V).

The results of the three-way analysis of variance for the evaluative dimension of the dependent measure of attitude are reported in Table VI. The analysis of variance revealed a significant ($F = 4.952$, $p < .05$) gender of source by language usage interaction. The significant interaction indicated the need for post hoc tests to isolate the significant treatment conditions. The Duncan's Multiple Range tests did not reveal significant differences among any of the treatment conditions.

There were no significant main or interaction effects for the caution dimension of attitude (see Table VII).

Discussion

In the area of terminal credibility the results indicated that on the qualification dimension of source credibility there were no differences in the perceived credibility of the sources between the pretest and the posttest. Baudhuin (1971) found that although obscene language tended to lower a source's credibility, the overall ratings indicated that a high credible source was more authoritative (or qualified) than a low credible source. Baudhuin (1971) used exactly the same experimental topic (advocating retention of Capital Punishment), very similar independent variables (source credibility, gender, and obscene language) and dependent variables (source credibility and attitude). The fact that the results of this study mirror the results of the Baudhuin (1971) study on the credibility variable strengthens confidence in the results of this experiment. As in the Baudhuin (1971) study, McCroskey and Mehrley (1970) used experimenter intuition to induce different levels of initial source credibility (high and low) and found that these sources were rated in the predicted manner on a posttreatment measure of source credibility. The same procedure (experimenter intuition) and results were evidenced in a study by Ware and Tucker (1974). The findings of these two studies lend further support to the results of this study concerning the source credibility variable.

Using Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Festinger, 1957) there are three possible explanations for the findings of this study on the source credibility variable. First, it is possible that the position a source takes on an issue has no effect on that source's credibility. Second,

the subjects may have derogated the message without derogating the source. Third, the subjects may have refused to connect the message with the source.

The results of the present experiment revealed low credible sources to be more persuasive than high credible sources. These results contradict the findings of the majority of past studies reviewed measuring the persuasive effects of different levels of source credibility. It is possible that the subjects in the present experiment were persuaded more by the low credible sources than the high credible sources as a direct consequent of the message topic advocated. The subjects tested may have been very anti-Capital Punishment. This being the case, a strong argument for Capital Punishment from a highly credible source may have imposed a significant threat to their attitude position. On the other hand, a low credible source may have posed less of a threat to their attitude position. If these conditions were present, then it seems likely that the subjects would have responded more favorably to the less threatening situation. Dissonance Theory states that the greater the pressure beyond the minimum needed to change a person's attitude, the less his attitude will move in the desired direction. The low credible source condition may have represented the minimum point beyond which the subjects would have responded less favorably toward any further attempts at persuasion.

In the area of intense language the results did not indicate that intense language in a persuasive message will elicit more favorable attitudes toward the message position than the use of non-intense language. The converse was reported. The results on the social dimension of attitude measurement revealed a three-way interaction. The low credible male source using non-intense language condition elicited the

most favorable responses from the subjects toward the message position. This finding contradicted the results of the Emmert (1974) and Reinsch (1971) studies. Both of these studies were investigating one factor (language usage). McCroskey and Dunham (1966), and Holtzman (1966) argue that it may be impossible to exclude credibility from any communication experiment. It is possible that the results of both the Emmert (1974) and Reinsch (1971) studies were influenced by the credibility variable. This study, like the Baudhuin (1971) study, used very similar research designs which included the potentially confounding variable of credibility. Baudhuin (1971) reported very similar results to this study on the effect of the language variable. He found obscene language to be a depressor of attitude change. Under given conditions, low intensity language was more persuasive than high intensity language.

The investigation of gender of source revealed no significant effects on the dependent variables. Baudhuin (1971) found that the gender of the sources did not affect their credibility or persuasiveness. Two studies (Goldberg, 1968; and Wheeless, 1971) manipulating gender of source as an independent variable have reported contradictory results with regard to the credibility or persuasiveness of male and female sources. These two studies had in common the fact that they were manipulating one variable (gender of source). They did not attempt to control the variable of credibility by pretesting. This factor may have affected the results. It is possible that in the Goldberg (1968) study the male sources were initially higher in credibility than the female sources. This study attempted to alleviate the problem by pretesting to establish sources of both genders with equal

initial credibility. The Wheeless (1971) study found that male speakers were more credible than female speakers. Wheeless did not control for the initial credibility levels of his sources by pretesting. It is possible that the male sources were initially higher in credibility than the female sources.

This study and the Baudhuin (1971) study used very similar experimental designs and reported the same results for the gender variable. The consistency of the results on the gender variable between the two studies makes a strong argument for accepting the conclusions of this study with regard to the gender variable.

A tentative conclusion may be drawn from this study with regard to the gender variable. If male and female sources have the same initial credibility, then gender of source does not affect that source's terminal credibility or persuasiveness.

Suggestions for Future Research

The results of the present study raise several questions with regard to the findings of past studies. The commonly held belief that a source with high credibility is more persuasive than a source with low credibility was not supported. This finding points to the situational property of source credibility. The most effective level of source credibility in a persuasive situation might be determined by a combination of situational factors (such as language usage and gender of source). Further research in the field of credibility should be conducted to make this determination.

The findings of past studies dealing with intense language were contradicted by the present study. This discrepancy points to the

need for more multi-factored research using language intensity as an independent variable.

Finally, the present experiment contradicted past studies that found male or female sources to be more credible or persuasive. These findings indicate the need for more multi-factored research including the gender variable.

REFERENCES

Andersen, K., and Clevenger, T., Jr. A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos. Speech Monographs. 1963, 30, 59-78.

Baudhuin, S. Obscene Language and Persuasive Communication: An Experimental Study. Dissertation Abstracts. June, 1971, 31.

Berlo, D., Lemmert, J., and Mertz, R. Dimensions for Evaluating the Acceptability of Message Sources. Public Opinion Quarterly. Winter, 1969-70, 563-576.

Bettinghaus, R. P. Persuasive Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Bowers, J. W. Language Intensity, Social Introversion, and Attitude Change. Speech Monographs. Nov., 1963, 30, 345-352.

_____, and Osborn, M. Attitudinal Effects of Selected Types of Concluding Metaphors in Persuasive Speeches. Speech Monographs. 1966, 31, 147-155.

Bruning, J., and Kintz, B. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Illinois: Scott, Roresman and Co., 1968.

Cathcart, R. An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Four Methods of Presenting Evidence. Speech Monographs. 1955, 22, 227-233.

Emmert, P. An Experimental Study of Language Intensity and Perception of Message Strength. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Wyoming, 1974.

Gilkinson, H., Paulson, S., and Sikkink, D. Effects of Order and Authority in an Argumentative Speech. Quarterly Journal of Speech. 1954, 50, 183-192.

Goldberg, P. A. Are Women Prejudiced Against Women? Transaction. April, 1968, 28-30.

Greenberg, B. and Miller, G. The Effects of Low-Credible Sources on Message Acceptance. Speech Monographs. 1966, 31, 127-136.

Haiman, R. An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking. Speech Monographs. September, 1949, 16, 190-202.

Holtzman, P. Confirmation of Ethos as a Confounding Element in Communication Research. Speech Monographs. 1966, 31, 464-466.

Hovland, C. I., and Mandell, W. An Experimental Comparison of Conclusion Drawing by the Communicator and the Audience. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1952, 47, 581-588.

King. T. An Experimental Study of the Effect of Ethos upon the Immediate and Delayed Recall of Information. Central States Speech Journal. 1966, 17, 22-28.

Knower, F. Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitudes: I. A Study of the Effect of Oral Argument on Changes in Attitude. Journal of Social Psychology. 1935, 6, 315-347.

Kraus, S. An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Negroes and Whites in Achieving Racial Attitude Change Via Kinescope Recordings. Speech Monographs. 1960, 27, 87-88.

Lorge, I., and Curtis, C. Prestige, Suggestion, and Attitudes. Journal of Social Psychology. 1936, 7, 386-402.

McCroskey, J. Scales for the Measurement of Ethos. Speech Monographs. 1966, 33, 65-72.

_____, Dunham, R. Ethos: A Confounding Element in Communication Research. Speech Monographs. 1966, 31, 456-463.

McEwen, W. J., and Greenberg, B. The Effects of Message Intensity on Receiver Evaluations of Source, Message and Topic. Journal of Communication. December, 1970, 20, 340-350.

Mehrley, R. S., and McCroskey, J. C. Opinionated Statements and Attitude Intensity as Predictors of Attitude Change and Source Credibility. Speech Monographs. March, 1970, 37, 47-52.

Paulson, S. Experimental Study of Spoken Communications: The Effects of the Speaker and Acknowledgement of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retension and Shift of Opinion. Speech Monographs. 1954, 21, 267-271.

Pheterson, G. I. Female Prejudice Against Men. Unpublished Manuscript. Connecticut College, 1969.

Reinsch, N. L. An Investigation of the Effects of the Metaphor and Simile in Persuasive Discourse. Speech Monographs. June, 1971, 38, 142-145.

Schweitzer, D. A. The Effect of Presentation on Source Evaluation. The Quarterly Journal of Speech. 1971, 56, 33-39.

Sikkink, D. An Experimental Study of the Effects on the Listener of Anticlimax Order and Authority in an Argumentative Speech. Southern Speech Journal. 1956, 22, 73-78.

Ware, P. and Tucker, R. Heckling as Distraction: An Experimental Study of Its Effects on Source Credibility. Speech Monographs. 1974, 41, 185-188.

Wheeless, L. R. Attitude and Credibility in the Prediction of Attitude Change: A Regression Approach. Speech Monographs. 1974, 41, 277-281.

_____. The Effects of Comprehension Loss on Persuasion. Speech Monographs. November, 1971, 38, 327-330.

Whitehead, J. L. Effects of Authority-based Assertion on Attitude and Credibility. Speech Monographs. November, 1971, 38, 311-315.

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SAFETY

Source	df	SS	MS	F^A	p^B
Sex (A)	1	1.781	1.781	3.361	N.S.D.
Credibility (B)	1	.415	.415	.783	N.S.D.
Language (C)	1	.424	.424	.799	N.S.D.
A X B	1	.724	.724	1.365	N.S.D.
A X C	1	1.670	1.670	3.151	N.S.D.
B X C	1	.105	.105	.198	N.S.D.
A X B X C	1	.142	.142	.269	N.S.D.
Error	116	61.485	.530	-	-

[A]Critical F1, 116 < .05 = 3.92

[B]Sig. = p < .05 and N.S.D. = No Significant Difference

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR QUALIFICATION

Source	df	SS	MS	F[A]	p[B]
Sex (A)	1	.0142	.0142	.0186	N.S.D.
Credibility (B)	1	10.3240	10.3240	13.4440	Sig.
Language (C)	1	.6122	.6122	.7970	N.S.D.
A X B	1	.5250	.5250	.6840	N.S.D.
A X C	1	.3030	.3030	.3950	N.S.D.
B X C	1	.2750	.2750	.3590	N.S.D.
A X B X C	1	.0190	.0190	.0260	N.S.D.
Error	116	89.0730	.7680	-	-

[A] Critical F1, 116 < .05 = 3.92

[B] Sig. = p < .05 and N.S.D. = No Significant Difference

TABLE III

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR DYNAMISM

Source	df	SS	MS	F[A]	p[B]
Sex (A)	1	.863	.863	1.866	N.S.D.
Credibility (B)	1	.299	.299	.648	N.S.D.
Language (C)	1	1.677	1.677	3.624	N.S.D.
A X B	1	.398	.398	.860	N.S.D.
A X C	1	.000	.000	.000	N.S.D.
B X C	1	.069	.069	.151	N.S.D.
A X B X C	1	.005	.005	.011	N.S.D.
Error	116	53.670	.463	-	-

[A] Critical F1, 116 < .05 = 3.92

[B] Sig. = p < .05 and N.S.D. = No Significant Difference

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF ATTITUDE

Source	df	SS	MS	F[A]	p[B]
Sex (A)	1	1.907	1.907	1.205	N.S.D.
Credibility (B)	1	6.986	6.986	4.413	Sig.
Language (C)	1	3.048	3.048	1.925	N.S.D.
A X B	1	1.526	1.526	.964	N.S.D.
A X C	1	.021	.021	.013	N.S.D.
B X C	1	.044	.044	.028	N.S.D.
A X B X C	1	6.777	6.777	4.281	Sig.
Error	116	183.638	1.583	-	-

[A] Critical F1, 116 < .05 = 3.92

[B] Sig. = p < .05 and N.S.D. = No Significant Difference

TABLE V

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE TESTS

Source	$\bar{x}_1$	$\bar{x}_2$	df_1	df_2	Critical Value	$p < .05$
Cell 112 - Cell 122	5.069	3.865	17	16	1.204	S.D.
Cell 111 - Cell 122	4.903	3.865	14	16	1.038	S.D.

Note S.D. = Significant Difference at $p < .05$

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE EVALUATIVE DIMENSION OF ATTITUDE

Source	df	SS	MS	F[A]	p[B]
Sex (A)	1	.443	.443	.166	N.S.D.
Credibility (B)	1	.788	.788	.297	N.S.D.
Language (C)	1	.332	.332	.125	N.S.D.
A X B	1	2.623	2.623	.988	N.S.D.
A X C	1	13.159	13.159	4.952	Sig.
B X C	1	1.855	1.855	.698	N.S.D.
A X B X C	1	3.836	3.836	1.444	N.S.D.
Error	116	308.267	2.657	-	-

[A] Critical F1, 116 < .05 = 3.92

[B] Sig. = $p < .05$ and N.S.D. = No Significant Difference

TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE CAUTION DIMENSION OF ATTITUDE

Source	df	SS	MS	F[A]	p[B]
Sex (A)	1	3.199	3.199	2.474	N.S.D.
Credibility (B)	1	.012	.012	.010	N.S.D.
Language (C)	1	.600	.600	.464	N.S.D.
A X B	1	1.428	1.428	1.104	N.S.D.
A X C	1	.627	.627	.485	N.S.D.
B X C	1	.683	.683	.528	N.S.D.
A X B X C	1	.073	.073	.054	N.S.D.
Error	116	149.963	1.293	-	-

[A] Critical F1, 116 < .05 = 3.92

[B] Sig. = $p < .05$ and N.S.D. = No Significant Difference